DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 164 441 SP 012 802

AUTHOR MacNaughton, Robert H.
TITLE Partnership in Spirit and in Fact: A Description of the Parma Teacher Education Project.
PUB DATE 78
NOTE 23p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Supervisors; Cooperating Teachers; *Cooperative Programs; *Field Experience Programs; Higher Education; Learning Modules; *Preservice Education; *Program Descriptions; Program Evaluation; *Public Schools; *Student Teachers; Teacher Centers

ABSTRACT

A field experience cooperative education program between Cleveland State University and a local public school is described. The program consisted of three major segments: the Junior Participators Program, the Parma Teacher Education Center North, and the Curriculum and Methods Program. The first program provided supervised work with children during the junior year of a student's professional coursework. The teacher center segment sought to promote improvement of both preservice and inservice teachers through an interactive process. The curriculum and methods program was guided by two principles: the preparation of teachers should be a team effort involving academic specialists, experts in instructional methodology, and classroom teachers in the field; and performance standards for the methods students should be established and a systematic process established to enable the student to attain them. This last segment was evaluated by both students and the preservice and inservice teachers involved. Results showed that a successful program had been established both in terms of teachers using teaching strategies and resources, and in planning, evaluating, and achieving learning objectives. (DS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED164441

JAN 22 11 27 AM '79

PARTNERSHIP IN SPIRIT AND IN FACT:
A DESCRIPTION OF THE PARMA TEACHER EDUCATION PROJECT

Across America, state education departments have admonished teacher training institutions to again revise standards. In Ohio, by 1980, all colleges approved for teacher education will have instituted new certification standards which require that all programs embody new and substantially increased field experiences for pre-service teachers. The effectiveness of these increased experiences in Ohio as elsewhere will depend, to a great extent, on whether a working spirit of partnership exists between college and public school personnel involved in making field experience happen.

The relationship between Cleveland State University's College of Education and the Parma, Ohio Public Schools is a working partnership of long duration. The programs in this relationship involve substantial numbers of undergraduates enrolled in the College of Education. They also provide direction to other teacher training institutions that wish to cooperate with public schools in an extensive field oriented pre-service program.

The College of Education and the Parma Schools work cooperatively in three major segments of the undergraduate program. These segments are designated as the Junior Participators (J.P.) Program, the Parma Teacher Education Center (T.E.C.) North, and the Curriculum and Methods Program. To provide a manageable focus to this paper, the emphasis is placed on the description and evaluation data which support the development of the Curriculum and Methods Program.

SP013 803

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert H. MacNaughton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Program Descriptions

Junior Participators' (J.P.) Program

The Junior Participators' Program represents the first effort at College of Education - Parma School cooperation. In December of 1971, Parma representatives approached the College to join their differentiated staffing project by initiating a field based project in the Parma Schools. Initiation of the program involved joint planning and goal setting along with role definition in terms of organization, governance, and supervision.

The Junior Participators' Program provides supervised work with children during the junior year of a student's professional course work. The J.P.'s, as they are called, are assigned to a teaching team in a flexibly organized elementary school where they work with and assist the professional staff by performing noninstructional and instructional tasks. Consequently, students gain a variety of experiences with children, teaching materials, and professional educators.

The cooperative nature of the program was significant from the very beginning. The presence of our students in the elementary schools is seen as a definite advantage by teachers and administrators of the school system. Concurrently, the College of Education faculty have the use of the facilities in the schools and the assistance of Parma teachers to enable students to increase their competencies during three quarters and, finally, refining skills during another quarter of student teaching experience. Finally, the student participants in the project receive financial help to defray tuition costs and transportation expenses.

Teacher Education Center-North (Parma T.E.C. North)

The Cleveland State University, College of Education has placed student teachers in Parma since the founding of the College twelve years ago. Con-

current with the development of the J.P. Program and the secondary methods program, the Parma student teacher program has evolved from a traditional arrangement toward a more innovative Teacher Education Center operation.

The Center Coordinator (a Parma employee) places students and chairs the Advisory Committee composed of University and Center representatives. A major responsibility of the Committee is to allocate monies from a Professional Development Fund. The Fund is derived from money contributed by the University and earmarked for professional development (see Appendix A for the contract). Money is generated to the Fund as a result.

The Parma Center is founded on the premise that the concentration of students in a limited number of selected sites over a period of time will result in the following:

1. A cadre of exemplary classroom teachers interested in the preparation of pre-service students.
2. A dependable supply of trained pre-service professionals to enhance the pupil-teacher relationship in cooperating schools.
3. Consistent reinforcement among methods instructors, university supervisors, and cooperating teachers of a model of good teaching against which to assist and assess the work of the pre-service student.
4. Increased opportunities for in-service development.

Money is generated for the Fund as a result of shared supervision by the Center Coordinator who maintains weekly contacts with the cooperating teachers. Students who are doing well are visited less often than they would be in a traditional setting. The savings in faculty time translated into money are contributed to the Fund. The University also makes direct contributions to the Fund for methods related field experience. To date, eighty percent of the money has been given to TEC Center faculty for course work approved by the Committee. The Fund money has been used for awards to

teachers to purchase materials for instructional innovations and grants for attending conferences.

Curriculum and Methods: A Field Based Teacher Education Program

Curriculum and Methods is a program with a distinctive history. It is a product of continuing input from different faculty, both college and public school, with varying educational philosophies. The program created in the Fall of 1969 attempted to bring together those concerned with what to teach and those concerned with how to teach into the real atmosphere of the classroom. The guiding principles were:

1. Preparation of teachers should be a team effort involving academic specialists, experts in instructional methodology, and classroom teachers in the field.
2. Performance standards for the methods students should be established and a systematic process established to enable the student to attain them.

To implement these principles, the College of Education merged the separate Tests and Measurements, Subject Area Methods, and General Methods courses to a block and redesigned them as a professional quarter to be taken just prior to student teaching. The program is required of all students seeking secondary certification and is supported out of normal departmental funds. All students register for twelve quarter hours of credit, blocking out the morning for the ten week quarter.

Initially, the program was primarily university based, although it included two field experiences. One was largely observational, and the second provided teaching experiences. From the beginning, the intent was to have the entire experience in a public school, preferably one of the existing student teaching centers. The decision to choose Parma was based on three factors:

1. the successful operation of the J.P. Program.

2. the effective cooperation with the Parma Schools in Parma TEC North Center.

3. Parma's interest in teacher education as exemplified by their continued willingness to support and assign a district teacher to facilitate the work of the Center.

During the Fall of 1974 and the Winter of 1975, extensive discussions between COE and Parma representatives finalized arrangements to move the total secondary methods program to Parma Schaaf Junior High School, starting in the Spring of 1975. The logistical problems were enormous. To move a program with a quarterly enrollment of forty to sixty students, involving four to eight university faculty, dozens of classroom teachers, and a myriad of rooms, equipment, and supplies, necessitated the skillful attention of the Parma facilitator and the closest cooperation with CSU administrators.

The Curriculum and Methods Program consists of three phases: Instructional Development, Interactive Skills and Laboratory Experiences. One instructor responsible for each phase is a member of the instructional team. The three person team meets to plan classes, to coordinate class and field experiences, and to anticipate needs in the coming week. In addition, the general methods team meets weekly with the subject area methods instructors (some of whom are from the Liberal Arts College) to coordinate efforts. A graduate assistant has also been utilized to assist in planning, operation of media equipment, and preparation of materials.

The Instructional Development phase emphasizes curriculum units and instructional materials as important determiners of teaching performance. The many planning and development competencies are taught and assessed through student creation of an instructional unit organized into a Learning

Activity Package. The LAPs are systematically organized units which include rationale, content analysis, objectives, activities and evaluation procedures.

University and public school faculty closely cooperate to integrate the development of the LAP with the classroom teaching. Early in the quarter, the Parma facilitator assigns each CSU methods student to a Parma senior or junior high classroom teacher who has volunteered to work in the program. During the first eight weeks of the ten week experience, the CSU student spends three mornings a week with his university methods teachers and two with his assigned classroom teacher. During the ninth week, the CSU student teaches his LAP to his Parma class for five days. Both the university instructor and the classroom teacher evaluate the pre-service student's instruction. The classroom teacher's evaluation of the field work is a significant variable in determining the student's grade.

The students develop objectives, pre and post tests, learning hierarchies, activities and evaluation units for their LAPs,gaining approval of their progress at each stage from the classroom teacher and university instructor. During the week that the students teach their LAPs, university faculty and classroom teachers assess the CSU student's ability to attain their instructional objectives.

Evaluation of the Curriculum and Methods Program focuses on whether the student is able to create a Learning Activity Package congruent with accepted principles of instructional development. Specifically, students are required to:

1. write clearly stated instructional objectives appropriate to the class.

2. select activities with a demonstrated relationship between objectives and the activities selected.

3. design evaluation procedures which have a demonstrated relationship to the objectives.

In addition, it was intended that the movement of the program to the field would result in a substantial positive change in student perception of the following areas:

1. the usefulness and relevance of method's courses

2. their own ability to develop a systematically designed Learning Package

3. the effectiveness of team teaching

Program Evaluation

Curriculum and Methods has been assessed from two perspectives. First, the program has been repeatedly evaluated by students at the conclusion of each quarter's experience. The data generated from this process yields potentially useful information to construct inferences concerning the quality of the program. Interestingly, direct questions which focus on field experiences, public school personnel, and on-site methods instruction elicit consistently positive ratings from Cleveland State University students. Consequently, such questions do not evidence changes in student perceptions as the program developed into a more completely field based (on site) operation. To surface growth, attention must be shifted to other items. Three items of significant interest are displayed in Table 1.

The data generated by the three items indicates that substantial positive changes have occurred in the way secondary teaching methods students view the program. The three items "Effectiveness of Team Teaching," "Development of Learning Package," and "Effectiveness of General Methods" are closely

Item	Fall, 1974 n=58	Fall, 1975 n=51	Fall, 1976 n=42
Effectiveness of General Methods Instruction	2.50*	2.00	1.66
Development of a Learning Package	2.40	2.08	1.17
Effectiveness of Team Teaching	3.34	2.08	1.17

Table 1. Comparison of Means on Significant Items from Quarterly Evaluations of EDS 300, Fall, 1974 - Fall, 1976.

*Where 0 is "very effective", 3 is "average", 6 is "highly ineffective".

related to the quality of the program development process. Items one and three assess relevance of instruction and cooperation among instructors. Both are facilitated by a highly developed partnership between university methods instructors and public school educators. The Learning Package item is also significant since the LAP is the vehicle used to integrate theory and practice, college classroom and application site in the public schools, university instructor and school educator.

What changes in the program can be linked to the increasing positive perceptions of the three items described above? Considering that changes have attempted to strengthen the integration between the university and public school system, the improvement in student perceptions becomes increasingly significant in evidencing program effectiveness. Specifically, since the Fall of 1974:

1. the program has moved on-site to a Parma City Junior High.
2. the Learning Package assignment now requires that the EDS 300 student develop and implement a unit of instruction for an actual classroom of children in cooperation with a public school educator.
3. Parma school educators teach lessons and assist in the evaluation of students.

The second perspective from which the Curriculum and Methods Program effectiveness can be viewed is from student teachers and cooperating teachers who participated in it. Twenty-four individuals (twelve cooperating teachers and twelve student teachers) were chosen at random from those who were affected by the changes described earlier. Each person was interviewed during the Fall and Winter of 1976 by a graduate assistant who had not been involved in the program. The interview form elicited responses to a series of questions, two of which deserve discussion.

1. How would you describe the relationship which developed between your student teacher/cooperating teacher and yourself? (The two had worked together earlier during the program and now were reunited in the cooperating teacher/student teacher relationship.)

Twenty-two individuals expressed positive comments. Most commonly expressed sentiments were "helpful," "cooperative," "professional," "knew what was expected." Two cooperating teachers expressed reservations regarding their student teachers, neither of which related to the students' professional preparation.

2. During the methods quarter, a student develops, with assistance from the classroom teacher, a LAP curriculum unit to be taught in an actual classroom. Of what value is this activity?

Twenty-one interviewees expressed positive comments. Such statements as "very valuable," "helped to plan and organize content," and "helpful as a transition to teaching" were repeated by both students and teacher.

In addition, the evaluation form (see Appendix B) used by the College of Education to guide and record assessments of student teaching performance yields more support for the success of the cooperative program. The students are assessed by both university supervisors and public school cooperating teachers according to the following rating scale:

Outstanding Level of Professional Achievement	Acceptable Level of Professional Achievement	Professional Level of Performance not Achieved
1-2	3-4	5

The ratings are awarded in the following categories:

A. Planning, evaluating and achieving learning objectives

B. Using teaching strategies and resources (variety and skill of use)

C. Cooperation (receptivity to suggestions, rapport with colleagues)

D. Management and discipline

E. Contribution to environment for learning (rapport with students, encouragement, support and acceptance of students).

The first two categories are of uppermost importance since they relate directly to Learning Package development, and the LAP was the vehicle used to mesh university instructors and Parma school educators into a working team. To investigate the evaluation form results, the question was asked, "What can we learn from the judgments by cooperating teachers and university supervisors about the teaching performance of a random sample of thirty student teachers who participated in the experience?" Table 2 displays the mean results of the supervisory evaluations in the two relevant categories.

	Cooperating Teachers	University Supervisors
Planning, Evaluating and Achieving Learning Objectives	1.57	1.50
Using Teaching Strategies and Resources	1.67	1.70

Table 2. Mean Results from Student Teaching Instrument

The results of the evaluations shown in Table 2 indicate that the students were highly regarded by both cooperating teachers and university supervisors. As a group, they were judged to have reached an "outstanding level of professional achievement." Not one of the thirty student teachers was judged to have exhibited less than a professional level of achievement in either category.

Summary of Evaluation Results

Combining the course evaluations and student teaching evidence together, the conclusion can be made that a successful cooperative activity is in operation. The two perspectives reveal a gradually deepening relationship between a college of education and a public school district. A relationship that began with informal agreements and smaller projects developed through the efforts of a few people with common ideas. These informal agreements and small scale projects matured into a many faceted, cooperative, teacher education program. The total effect of the relationship has been to enhance the competency and effectiveness of future teachers.

APPENDIX A

A G R E E M E N T

This agreement between the Parma City Schools and The College of Education of The Cleveland State University is made for the purpose of providing funds for payment of supervising teachers and related costs for the 1977-1978 partnership of the Teacher Education Center.

W I T N E S S E T H

The College of Education of The Cleveland State University agreed to pay the Parma Public Schools Teacher Education Fund on a basis of the schedule outlined in Part III of the attached agreement.

In addition, the Parma Public Schools will make every effort to cooperate with the College of Education to make available time, resources, and facilities in order to meet the teacher education needs of the Center participants.

In witness whereof the parties have hereunto set their hands this_____day of_____, 19____.

THE CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

by_____
Richard J. McArdle
Dean, College of Education
Cleveland State University

by_____
Walter B. Waetjen, President

PARMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by_____

PARMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS - CLEVELAND STATE UNIVERSITY

An Agreement Between College of Education
Cleveland State University and the Parma
Public Schools to Operate a Center 1977-1978

I. Purpose

The purpose of the Teacher Education Center is to meet the needs of the University and the Parma Public Schools for pre-service and in-service education and to coordinate the efforts of both school and University in their study of teaching and supervision. The Center will involve interested and competent teachers in a responsible way in the pre-service education of teachers, and enable the University to offer meaningful and relevant in-service and graduate programs to experienced teachers.

Further considerations:

A. A center, for the purposes of the contract, is defined as a school or cluster of schools where considerable responsibility for the pre-service preparation of teachers rests with the school faculty.

B. Wherever possible, planning, implementation, and supervision of field experiences should be a joint effort of the College of Education and the Parma Public Schools.

C. Whenever possible, the College of Education should extend itself to promote and provide professional development opportunities to public school teachers in participating schools.

D. Whenever possible, cooperative efforts between the COE, other universities, and the public school system should be allowed to mature in a fluid, flexible arrangement consistent with changing goals.

II. Objectives

Teacher Education Center objectives are to:

A. Involve competent teachers who are interested in participating in the field experience part of pre-service education.

B. Offer to schools, through the provision of a reliable supply of pre-service teachers, sufficient staff to enhance implementation of team teaching, various staffing arrangements, individualized instruction, tutoring, etc., in order to provide increased services for pupils.

C. Create a place in the schools where teaching as an intellectual and social endeavor is subject to continuous study.

D. Prepare classroom teacher educators in order that they may be able to assume responsibility for the field experience component of pre-service teacher preparation.

E. Provide close professional direction and supervision for pre-service teachers.

F. Provide consultation on pedagogical and curriculum matters for both in-service and pre-service teachers.

G. Develop teachers skilled in ability to analyze their own teaching and the teaching of others.

H. Develop teachers who are knowledgeable in a variety of methods and curriculum innovations and who have ability to transmit this information to pre-service teachers.

I. Improve pre-service field experience for University students through the following:

1. reinforcing University classroom learning.

2. providing an opportunity to select appropriate objectives and systematically plan instruction.

3. studying and practicing various kinds of verbal and non-verbal behavior.

4. providing a basis for exchange of ideas and for cooperative problem solving.

5. increasing readiness for professional education courses.

6. offering opportunity for gradual induction into roles and responsibilities of the teacher.

7. allowing students wide observation of all roles of the teacher throughout the school.

8. giving an opportunity to try out a wide variety of approaches and techniques.

9. providing an opportunity to apply classroom learning while making professional decisions.

III. Implementation

To implement the above purposes and objectives for the 1977-1978 school year, the parties agree to the following terms regarding their partnership in the Teacher Education Center.

A. Cleveland State University will assign student teachers to the Center and will:

1. grant $75.00 to the district for each student teacher.

2. grant $75.00 to the Teacher Education Center Fund for each student teacher assigned to the Center.

3. provide a liaison person to participate in the Center decision making through a Center Coordinating Committee described in V below.

4. provide supervision by University faculty in a manner described in IV B below.

B. Cleveland State will assign pre-student teaching experience to the Center and will grant:

1. $100.00 per quarter to the Teacher Education Center fund for secondary pre-student teaching field experience conducted at Center schools.

2. $75.00 per quarter to the Teacher Education Center for elementary pre-student teaching experience conducted at Center schools.

C. The TEC schools will provide:

1. the setting for the Cleveland State University student teachers and field experience students wherever feasible.

2. supervising teachers who will share their training and experience and will supervise clinical students assigned to the Center.

3. facilitators, field associates, and staff to serve on the Center Committee.

IV. Role Descriptions

There are a number of role positions at the Center.

A. An individual liaison person will act as an intermediary (facilitator) between cooperating public school teacher and University supervisor. He/she shall (with assistance from the elected school representative and the Center Committee acting as a body) carry out the following functions:

1. participates in the deliberations and is committed to implementing the decisions made by the Center Coordinating Committee.

2. place student teachers and field experience students in consultation with the University supervisor.

3. meet periodically with teachers and/or develop survey instruments which can identify in-service needs relative to the development of classroom teacher educators.

4. maintain communication with the University supervisor on particular student needs and other teacher concerns.

5. participate with the University supervisor in planning and implementing periodic seminars for student teachers and field experience students.

6. disseminate to supervising teachers essential data emanating from the C.C.C. relative to supervision.

7. engage in such other duties as mutually agreed upon by the University and school district. Where additional duties such as teaching or student teaching supervision shall be required of the Coordinator, these shall be covered by a supplemental contract.

B. University Supervisor

A University supervisor assigned to TEC shall assume the normal position with two additional programmatic requirements determined by the unique nature of TEC. These requirements are:

1. Center supervisors may agree to assume a greater student teaching load since the school facilitator will be providing important support services. (See Center Facilitator's Functions). As a result of this support, the University supervisor will tailor a supervision schedule to primarily visit student teachers who are having difficulty. The dollar savings from the additional student teaching load will make up a Teacher Education Center Fund. (See the Center Coordinating Committee).

2. Center supervisors serve on the C.C.C. and participate in its deliberations and commitments.

C. Elected School Representative

A representative from the particular school faculty will be elected and serve as a member of the Center Coordinating Committee. The elected representative shall carry out the following functions:

1. participate in the Committee's deliberations and is committed to carry out the decisions made by the body.

2. assist the school facilitator, to the extent that time permits, with those tasks directly related to the Center's function. (See Center Facilitator's Functions).

D. The Supervising Teacher

The supervising teacher initiates experiences and guides student teachers and field work students in variety of school situations including planning, tutorial experience, parent conferences, discipline, and group dynamics. The supervising teacher will diagnose the level of competence of each student teacher and prescribe and provide appropirate experiences. The supervising teacher will provide formal evaluations of each student teacher.

V. Center Coordinating Committee

Initially the Center Coordinating Committee will be comprised of the Center Facilitator, the University Representatives, and Elected Faculty Representatives from participating schools. Future representation will be determined by the Committee. The Center Committee will meet regularly on school time. If substitutes are needed to permit Committee members to attend, money from the Professional Development Fund may be used to cover costs. Committee responsibilities include the following:

A. Identifying strengths and weaknesses within the Teaching Center and developing plans to improve program.

B. Surfacing of supervising teacher concerns relative to the supervisory relationship.

C. Disseminating among supervising teachers helpful information relative to field experience and student teaching supervision.

D. Developing guidelines and policy for money expenditure from the TEC fund.

VI. TEC Fund

The TEC Fund will be created from funds earmarked for TEC as a result of services rendered to CSU student teachers and field experience students. Money will be allotted to the Fund as described in IIIA and IIIB. Guidelines and policy for money expenditures from The TEC Fund will be developed by the Center Coordinating Committee. Monies will be deposited in an account designated by the Cleark-Treasurer.

The purpose of the Fund is as follows:

1. to facilitate improvement of instructional skills among Center teachers.

2. enable said teachers to refine their competencies as classroom teaher educators.

3. to carry out 1 and 2 above through formal courses, workshops, and other forms of professional development activity.

Based upon the request of either party, this agreement may be dissolve at the conclusion of any university quarter.

APPENDIX B

The Cleveland State University

STUDENT TEACHING EVALUATION

to be included in the placement file

Student s name _____ Date _____

Type of certification sought:

- ☐ Grades K - 3
- ☐ Grades K - 8
- ☐ Grades 1 - 8
- ☐ Grades 7 - 12 Subjects: _____
- ☐ Grades K - 12 Subject: _____

Student teaching assignment:

School: _____

Grade(s): _____

Subject(s): _____

Term and year: _____

EVALUATION OF STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE

Outstanding level of professional achievement 1 - 2

Acceptable level of professional achievement 3 - 4

Professional level of performance not achieved 5

	Highest Rating = 1				
	1	2	3	4	5
Planning, evaluating, and achieving learning objectives					
Using teaching strategies and resources (variety and skill of use)					
Cooperation (receptivity to suggestions, rapport with colleagues)					
Management and discipline					
Contribution to environment for learning (rapport with students, encouragement, support, and acceptance of students)					

Comments on the strengths, weaknesses, and general characteristics of the student teacher (appearance, dependability, effective communication, etc):

(Continue on reverse side if necessary.)

_____

Print or type name of university supervisor

_____

Signature, university supervisor